UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,254	12/20/2005	Raymond J.E. Hueting	GB030096US1	5647
65913 NXP, B.V.	7590 04/21/200	EXAMINER		
NXP INTELLE	CTUAL PROPERTY	KUO, WENSING W		
M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY I	DRIVE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN JOSE, CA	95131	2826		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/21/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/562,254	HUETING, RAYMOND J.E.		
English and	A 4 11 14		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	vv. vvendy Ruo	2020	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	r).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply original.	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t They raise new issues that would require further cor 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or			he issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. Lagrange The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 			-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> 	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13.			
	/Leonardo Andújar/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 2826	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding Applicant's response that regions 123 and 124 of Dennen cannot be considered "conductive shallow contact regions of source and drain regions" because Dennen labels regions 123 and 124 as source and drain and further labels a region 122a beneath regions 123 and 124 as undepleted portions, it is respectfully noted that although the applicant uses terms different from those of Dennen to label the claimed invention, this does not result in any structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art. The use of different terminology to describe the plurality of elements that constitute an integrated circuit as this is merely a writing style, and the way in which a structural limitation is expressed does not affect the configuration of the described elements.

Regarding Applicant's response that the examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness and has further failed to provide any evidence of motivation to combine the Hueting '348 and Dennen references, it is respectfully noted that these arguments are not persuasive for the reasons presented by the examiner in the Office action dated 30 January 2008.

Regarding Applicant's request for a clarification of which parts of Dennen are being combined with Hueting '348, it is respectufly noted that Dennen is specifically combined with Hueting '348 to teach conductive shallow regions that are lacking in Hueting '348 for the benefit of maximizing the breakdown voltage. Moreover, since the test of obviousness is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art (In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981)), it is respectfully emphasized that as taken in its entirety, the components of Dennen that contribute to maximizing the breakdown voltage may comprise conductive shallow source and drain contact regions and a tub region. Therefore, these elements may be combined with Hueting '348 to achieve the desired benefit. More specifically, the tub region and conductive shallow source and drain regions of Dennen may modify Hueting '348 (i.e. Figure 7) such that the combination will teach conductive shallow contact regions with a tub region beneath and surrounding the source, drain, and gate region of Hueting '348.